



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,571	02/08/2002	Chris Hamilton	PW 249773 P13688	2588
27496 7590 09/29/2009 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP P.O. BOX 10500 McLean, VA 22102				
EXAMINER				
DAZENSKI, MARC A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/29/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/071,571

Applicant(s)

HAMILTON, CHRIS

Examiner

MARC DAZENSKI

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 15 June 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive (in regards to the rejections of claims 13, 22, 24, and 36).

On page 8 of the remarks, Applicant argues, "the subject matter encompassed by terms at issue as recited in claims 22 and 36 is adequately described in the specification as to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the invention," and that further, "one skilled in the art would be able to practice the claimed invention because the term 'program code storage device' would be easily understood by one skilled in the art," as well as, "the scope of enablement described in the specification of the present application bears more than only a 'reasonable correlation' to a 'program code storage device.'" Applicant also makes similar arguments regarding the phrase "machine-readable storage medium." However, a careful reading of claims 22 and 36 show that the program code storage device comprises instructions causing a home media server to emulate assembly of an edited program. Although the specification describes a machine-readable storage medium (e.g., home media server with digital storage (130) in figure 1), nowhere does it say that the instructions causing a computer to enact the described method of emulating assembly of an edited program is stored on a program-code storage device *or* a machine-readable storage medium. Although home media server with digital storage (130) is an example of a machine-readable storage medium, this alone does not define it; further, since the phrase does not appear in the

specification, there is no support for the instructions causing a home media server to emulate assembly of an edited program being stored on a program code storage device. Still further, the lack of this phrase in the specification renders it unclear as to whether the "program code storage device" comprises statutory or non-statutory subject matter. The examiner maintains that the original rejection to claims 22 and 36 stands.

On page 9 of the remarks, Applicant argues that "various algorithms used to recognize content are well known in the art," and that claims 13 and 24 are not indefinite. Applicant further directs the examiner's attention to page 3 of the specification. However, the examiner notes that page 3 merely recites types of *content* (i.e., audio and video) and not *content recognition algorithms*. Nowhere in the specification is a "content recognition algorithm" disclosed; the closest example the examiner can find is at lines 1-2 of page 3 ("In particular, robust methods of home content recognition, selection, segmentation, and synchronization are disclosed."). This, however, does not particularly point out and distinctly claim a "content recognition algorithm" and therefore the examiner maintains the original rejection to claims 13 and 24.

On page 10 of the remarks, Applicant argues that Logan (US PgPub 2003/0093790) is an improper 102(e) reference because the parent document (US Patent 6,931,451) "does not disclose, teach, or suggest the disclosure from the '790 publication relied upon by the Examiner." After careful reconsideration, the examiner has determined that the applicant is correct in this regard and therefore withdraws the rejection to Logan of claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-16, 21-31, and 34-37.

However, the arguments are moot in view of the new found grounds of rejection which appear below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 22 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claims 22 and 36 are drawn to a program code storage device, comprising: a machine-readable storage medium; and machine-readable code, stored on the machine-readable storage medium. However, the terms "program code storage device," and "machine-readable storage medium" do not appear in the specification.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not understood as to what is meant by "using various content recognition algorithms" as definitions or examples of the content recognition algorithms are not explained in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-8, 10-16, 21-30, 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Novak et al (US Patent 7,032,177).

Regarding **claim 1**, Novak discloses a method and system for distributing personalized editions of media programs using bookmarks. Further, Novak discloses a system for distributing personalized editions of media programs, which reads on the claimed, "a home media server content management and processing system," as disclosed at column 8, lines 24-26 and exhibited in figure 4; the system comprising:

editing device (402) which allows a user to designate one or more points of interest within the media program, which reads on the claimed, "an editing platform running editing software," as disclosed at column 8, lines 30-54 and exhibited in figures 4 and 5;

a copy of the media program is received by the editing device (402), which reads on the claimed, "a database, contained in the editing platform, to store media producer specified multi-media content," as disclosed at column 8, lines 39-40 (wherein if the editing device is able to receive and store a copy of the media program then there must

be some type of memory/database/storage means comprised within; and further as disclosed at column 8, lines 24-29, editing device (402) may be a STB (102) which as shown in figure 3 comprises memory (306) as well as storage device (310));

bookmarks (406) which may definite points of interest within a media program and may be used by the playback device (404) to selectively skip from one point of interest to another during playback of the media program, as well as the bookmarks containing additional information, which reads on the claimed, "a set of instructions and data generated by a media producer to assemble an edited program using specified segments of the multi-media content," as disclosed at column 8, lines 35-38 as well as column 9, lines 14-37;

network (101) or internet (112) which is used to transmit bookmarks (406) from editing device (402) to playback device (404), which reads on the claimed, "a network to distribute the multi-media content, the set of instructions, and the data generated by a media producer to home media servers," as disclosed at column 8, lines 30-35; and,

playback device (404) which utilizes the received bookmarks (406) during presentation of the media program to present a personalized edition of the media program, which reads on the claimed, "a home media server to receive the multi-media content, the set of instructions, and the data from the editing platform via the network, wherein the home media server emulates assembly of the edited program using the multi-media content, the set of instructions and the data generated by a media producer, and displays the assembled edited program on a monitor," as disclosed at column 10, lines 35-38 and exhibited in figures 3-4, 7, and 14.

Regarding **claim 2**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). Further, Novak discloses the playback device accesses a copy of the media program from the same or a different source as the editing device, and for example, the playback device may access a copy of the media program on a DVD or may independently record the media program from a broadcast medium, which reads on the claimed, "wherein emulating assembly of the edited program includes using data to search a home media server storage medium and the Internet for multi-media content titles specified by the media producer," as disclosed at column 2, lines 59-63.

Regarding **claim 3**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). Further, Novak discloses that the media program may be recorded by the editing device (402) from a broadcast medium, or downloaded from a server, such as a video-on-demand server, which reads on the claimed, "wherein emulating assembly of the edited program includes using data to search, bid for, obtain rights to, schedule, and manage recording of broadcast, on-demand, and other media content," as disclosed at column 8, lines 24-47 and exhibited in figure 4.

Regarding **claim 4**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). Further, Novak discloses accessing the media program at the playback device, which reads on the claimed, "wherein the assembled edited program is stored in the home media server," as exhibited in figure 14 (specifically step (1412)).

Regarding **claim 5**, Novak discloses a method and system for distributing personalized editions of media programs using bookmarks. Further, Novak discloses a method for distributing personalized editions of media programs, which reads on the

claimed, "a method of providing home media server content management and processing," as disclosed at column 2, lines 28-29; the method comprising:

a user of an editing device creates a personalized edition including designating excerpts of a media program via bookmarks which include actions (606) and attributes (604), which reads on the claimed, "selecting, identifying, and storing by a media producer, of multi-media content as files to a storage medium within an editing platform to form files of the multi-media content; generating, by the media producer using an editing software program, a set of instructions and data for assembly of an edited program, said edited program including specified segments from the files of the multi-media content," as disclosed at column 9, lines 4-36 and column 11, lines 16-30;

a copy of the media program is received by the editing device, which reads on the claimed, "assembling the specified segments using the set of instructions and data to form the edited program; storing the edited program on the editing platform," as disclosed at column 8, lines 39-40;

the editing device then generates bookmarks defining each designated excerpt, a bookmark defining a beginning point or an end point of an excerpt, which reads on the claimed, "analyzing, using a software program, endpoint frames of each segment used in the assembly of the edited program, said analysis resulting in analysis data stored on the editing platform," as disclosed at column 3, lines 9-13;

the bookmarks are transmitted to the playback device via the internet (112) at which point they are used by the playback device (404) to present a personalized edition of the media program, which reads on the claimed, "distributing said files of the

multi-media content, the set of instructions, the data, and the analysis data to a home media server; and, emulating assembly of the edited program by said home media server using the files of the multi-media content, the set of instructions, the data, the analysis data, and a home media server editing program, said assembled edited program being stored in the home media server," as disclosed at column 10, lines 14-38.

Regarding **claim 6**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5). Further, Novak discloses the media program may be any type of audio and/or video program, and the playback device (404) accesses a copy of the media program from the same or different source as the editing device (402), which reads on the claimed, "wherein the multi-media content includes movies and music available through downloaded files via the internet," as disclosed at column 8, lines 40-41 and column 12, lines 27-30.

Regarding **claim 7**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5). Further, Novak discloses a bookmark (406) may be embodied as a frame index, offset, chapter reference, scene reference, or other non-time positional indicator within the media program, which reads on the claimed, "wherein identifying of the multi-media content includes assigning titles, said titles stored as title data on the storage medium within the editing platform," as disclosed at column 9, lines 21-23.

Regarding **claim 8**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 5 above.

Regarding **claim 10**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 5 above.

Regarding **claim 11**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5). Further, the examiner maintains the claim is the corresponding method to the apparatus of claim 3, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 3 above.

Regarding **claim 12**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 5 above.

Regarding **claim 13**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 12). Further, Novak discloses the bookmarks may be embodied as a frame index, offset, chapter reference, scene reference, or other non-time positional indicator within the media program, which reads on the claimed, "wherein specifying by the media producer, using the editing software program, includes using various content recognition algorithms," as disclosed at column 9, lines 21-23.

Regarding **claim 14**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 12). Further, Novak discloses the bookmarks include a non-linear or non-chronological path through the media program, which reads on the claimed, "wherein generating the set of instructions for assembly of the edited program includes manipulating and sequencing of the specified segments by the media producer using the editing software program, said manipulating including creating and storing a set of

manipulation instructions, said sequencing including producing and storing a sequence order," as disclosed at column 10, lines 49-61.

Regarding **claim 15**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 14). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 14 above.

Regarding **claim 16**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 14). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanations set forth in claims 5 and 14 above.

Regarding **claim 21**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 7). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 5 above.

Regarding **claim 22**, Novak discloses audio and video program recording, editing and playback systems using metadata. Further, the examiner maintains the claim is the corresponding computer program implementing the method of claim 5, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 5 above.

Regarding **claim 23**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 22). Further, the examiner maintains the claim is the corresponding computer program implementing the method of claim 12, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 12 above.

Regarding **claim 24**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 23). Further, the examiner maintains the claim is the corresponding computer

program implementing the method of claim 13, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 13 above.

Regarding **claim 25**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 23). Further, the examiner maintains the claim is the corresponding computer program implementing the method of claim 14, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 14 above.

Regarding **claim 26**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 25). Further, the examiner maintains the claim is the corresponding computer program implementing the method of claim 15, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 15 above.

Regarding **claim 27**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 25). Further, the examiner maintains the claim is the corresponding computer program implementing the method of claim 16, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 16 above.

Regarding **claim 28**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 22). Further, the examiner maintains the claim is the corresponding computer program implementing the method of claim 6, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 6 above.

Regarding **claim 29**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 22). Further, the examiner maintains the claim is the corresponding computer program implementing the method of claim 7, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 7 above.

Regarding **claim 30**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 22). Further, the examiner maintains the claim is the corresponding computer program implementing the method of claim 8, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 8 above.

Regarding **claim 34**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 22). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 22 above.

Regarding **claim 35**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 22). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 22 above.

Regarding **claim 36**, Novak discloses audio and video program recording, editing and playback systems using metadata. Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 22 above.

Regarding **claim 37**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 36). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 21 above.

Regarding **claim 38**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 36). Further, the examiner maintains the claim is the corresponding computer program implementing the method of claim 11, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 11 above.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Novak, in view of well-known prior art (see MPEP 2144.03).

Regarding **claim 9**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 8. Further, Novak discloses video compressed according to all MPEG standards, including MPEG4, which reads on the claimed, "where the media files are stored in various media formats, where video is stored as MPEG4," as disclosed at column 5, lines 41-47. However, although Novak discloses the media program may include any type of audio and/or video program (see column 2, lines 35-36), Novak does not explicitly disclose "audio is stored as MP3." The examiner maintains that it was notoriously old and well known in the art to store audio as MP3, and therefore takes Official Notice.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for distributing personalized editions of media programs using bookmarks of Novak to specifically include audio is stored as MP3, for the purpose of conserving bandwidth and storage capacity by using a lossy compression scheme.

Regarding **claim 31**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 30). Further, the examiner maintains the claim is the corresponding computer

program implementing the method of claim 9, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 9 above.

Claims 17, 19-20, 32, and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Novak, in view of Ellis et al (US Patent 5,436,653), hereinafter referred to as Ellis.

Regarding **claim 17**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5). However, Novak fails to disclose wherein the analysis includes at least one of a fast fourier transform (FFT) of each end point frame to form media producer fast fourier transform (FFT) data, and a decimation of each end point frame to form media producer decimated data. The examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include the missing limitations, as taught by Ellis.

In a similar field of endeavor, Ellis discloses a method and system for recognition of broadcast segments. Further, Ellis discloses the video and audio signals are supplied to the segment recognition subsystem (26), wherein frame signatures for each of the video and audio signals are generated which are thereafter compared to stored key signatures to determine if a match exists, the match information grouped for storage in a database, the video signals undergoing a vector transformation and the digitized audio supplied to the transformation and signature extraction module (206) which utilizes a FFT process for generating audio frame signatures and corresponding mask words, which reads on the claimed, "wherein the analysis includes at least one of a fast fourier transform (FFT) of each end point frame to form media producer fast fourier transform (FFT) data, and a decimation of each end point frame to form media producer

decimated data," as disclosed at column 10, lines 15-32; column 12, lines 40-53; and column 20, lines 13-17.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for distributing personalized editions of media programs using bookmarks of Novak to include the video and audio signals are supplied to the segment recognition subsystem (26), wherein frame signatures for each of the video and audio signals are generated which are thereafter compared to stored key signatures to determine if a match exists, the match information grouped for storage in a database, the video signals undergoing a vector transformation and the digitized audio supplied to the transformation and signature extraction module (206) which utilizes a FFT process for generating audio frame signatures and corresponding mask words, as taught by Ellis, for the purpose of allowing a computer to identify specific segments of a broadcast program.

Regarding **claim 19**, the combination of Novak and Ellis discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 17). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 17 above.

Regarding **claim 20**, the combination of Novak and Ellis discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 17). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 17 above.

Regarding **claim 32**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 22). Further, the examiner maintains that the claim is the computer program

implemented method of the method of claim 17, and therefore the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 17 above.

Regarding **claim 39**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 36). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 32 above.

Regarding **claim 40**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 39). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 19 above.

Regarding **claim 41**, Novak discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 39). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 20 above.

Claims 18 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Novak, in view of Ellis, further in view of well-known prior art (see MPEP 2144.03).

Regarding **claim 18**, the combination of Novak and Ellis discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 17). Further, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was old and well known in the art to include wherein a video frame is represented by a two- dimensional fast fourier transform (FFT), and an audio frame is represented by a one- dimensional fast fourier transform (FFT).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Logan and Ellis to include wherein a video frame is represented by a two- dimensional fast fourier transform (FFT), and an audio frame is represented by a one- dimensional fast fourier transform (FFT),

for the purpose of allowing a computer to identify specific segments of a broadcast program.

Regarding **claim 33**, the combination of Novak and Ellis discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 32). Further, the limitations of the claim are rejected in view of the explanation set forth in claim 18 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARC DAZENSKI whose telephone number is (571)270-5577. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (571)272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/MARC DAZENSKI/
Examiner, Art Unit 2621